## RECEIVED **CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

DEC 3 1 2007 PTO/SB/21 (12-07)
Approved for use through 12/31/2007. OMB 0651-0031

Under the Paperwork R	Reduction Act of 1995, no perso	U.S. Ons are required to respond to a cr	Patent and Tr effection of info	ademark Office; omnation unless	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE it displays a valid OMB control number.	
TRANSMITTAL FORM		Application Number	10/740486	10/740486 Dec. 22, 2003		
		Filing Date	Dec. 22, 2			
		First Named Inventor	Vanderhye			
		Art Unit	2625			
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)		Examiner Name	Singh			
Total Number of Pages in This Submission 7		Attorney Docket Number	The second section of the second section is a second section of the			
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)						
Fee Transmittal F	om ·	Drawing(s)		After	Allowance Communication to TC	
Fee Attac	Fee Attached		•		eal Communication to Board speals and Interferences	
✓ Amendment/Repty		Petition		Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)		
		Petition to Convert to a	ition to Convert to a		Proprietary Information	
After Final		Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocati			•	
Affidavits/declaration(s)		Change of Correspondence Address		Status Letter Other Enclosure(s) (ptease Identify		
Extension of Time Request		Terminal Disclaimer	ferminal Disclaimer		below):	
Express Abandonment Request		Request for Refund		techweb.com definition of rotos		
Information Disclosure Statement		CD, Number of CD(s)			•	
		Landscape Table on C	:D			
Certified Copy of Priority Remarks						
Document(s)						
Reply to Missing Parls/ Incomplete Application						
Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53						
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT						
Firm Name						
Signature / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /						
Printed name Robert A. Vanderhye						
Date Pon No.						
Decamber 31, 2007 Reg. No. 27,076						
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING						
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450. Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:						
Signature Route Carlel						
Typed or printed name Robert A. Vanderhye			·	Date	12/31/2007	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

# DEC 3 1 2007

#### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

U. S. APPLICATION

SN 10/740,486

Art Unit: 2625

Filed: December 22, 2003

Examiner: Singh

Inventors: Robert A. VANDERHYE

FOR: PRODUCING ARTWORK USING COLOR PRINTERS

December 31, 2007

Hon. Comm. Of Patents & Trademarks P O Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Responsive to the FINAL REJECTION of December 27, 2007, please consider the following:

## <u>REMARKS</u>

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of all of the pending claims in the previous action based upon the Abram et al reference. The Abram et al reference essentially has nothing to do with the claimed invention, and it is respectfully submitted that the majority of the statements made in the final rejection about the Abram et al reference simply are not correct.

Claims 1 and 24 call for a method of producing a piece of art work using a computer controlled color printer capable of printing a least three colors. One or more of the colors are selectively disabled, while NOT disabling all of the colors besides black. With the printer the non-disabled colors of the image are printed onto a substrate.

Abram et al nowhere teach producing a piece of artwork using a computer controlled color printer capable of printing at least three colors. No portion of the Abram ct al disclosure which allegedly discloses such a printer is indicated in any way in the final rejection, and in fact none exists. Rather all the printer in Abram et al does is print a line art image such as illustrated at 805 or 820 in figure 8. The line art merely provides